



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

school. He raises no serious doubt concerning the authenticity and genuineness of any of these seven epistles. He regards the last two chapters of Romans as a part of the original epistle, with the possible exception of the doxology, and in all references to the Acts he treats that book as a trustworthy historical document.

Certain views recently defended by Harnack, Ramsay, and others he treats with respect; but he does not, in general, accept them. He expresses no positive opinion with regard to the new chronology of Harnack and McGiffert, or the South-Galatian theory of Ramsay. He does not admit that Second Corinthians consists of fragments of two or more letters welded together, though he supposes that Paul wrote at least four letters to this church, of which First Corinthians is the second and Second Corinthians the fourth.

Among the most valuable features of the book are its discussions of such terms as *χάρις* (p. 196) and *οἱ ἄγιοι* (p. 257), and the careful exegesis of a few difficult passages, such as Rom. 3:21-26 and Phil. 2:5-11.

WILLIAM H. RYDER.

ANDOVER, MASS.

A HISTORICAL COMMENTARY ON ST PAUL'S EPISTLE TO THE GALATIANS. By W. M. RAMSAY, D.C.L., Professor in Aberdeen University; Hon. Fellow of Exeter and Lincoln Colleges, Oxford. London: Hodder & Stoughton; New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1900. Pp. x + 478. \$3.

THIS book falls into two almost equal parts, the first entitled "Historical Introduction" (to the epistle to the Galatians), and the second "Historical Commentary." Neither of these titles, however, is quite self-explanatory or quite correct. The introduction is rather a series of chapters on the geography, history, and civilization of the lands which were at length included in the Roman province of Galatia than what is ordinarily meant by an introduction. The commentary is a series of discussions of passages in the epistle which have specially interested Professor Ramsay.

The introduction is a most valuable and learned piece of work, and puts all students of the epistle deeply in Professor Ramsay's debt. The essence of its argument lies in three propositions: (1) That North Galatia, which before it was Galatian had been Phrygian, and before it was Phrygian had been primitive Anatolian, passed under Roman dominion without being to any considerable extent Hellenized; so that

in the middle of the first century the civilization of North Galatia was essentially Gallic or Romano-Gallic.<sup>1</sup> (2) That the civilization of South Galatia, on the contrary, was Græco-Asiatic. (3) That Paul's letter to the Galatians reflects the Greek civilization of South Galatia rather than the Romano-Gallic of North Galatia. Does Ramsay prove his case ?

The second of the three propositions may be granted, we assume, without hesitation.

Respecting the first, there are very few scholars living who are competent to criticise Ramsay from the point of view of fulness and accuracy of knowledge in this particular field. He has made the interior of Asia Minor so peculiarly his own that most other men must simply accept what he gives. Yet it may perhaps be permissible, even for one who has no expert knowledge of the geography or history of Asia Minor, to record an impression of the validity of the argument as such, fully accepting the historical evidence which Ramsay presents. Judging it thus, we are disposed to say that the mass of evidence which Ramsay presents shows beyond all reasonable doubt that North Galatia was much more slowly Hellenized than South Galatia, and that in the first century A. D. North-Galatian civilization was not distinctly Hellenic. But that North Galatia was totally non-Hellenic the evidence does not suffice to prove. Not only is it confessedly meager, so that the conclusion is to a certain extent simply the most probable inference from the evidence that exists today rather than one which is overwhelmingly established by clear proof, but a portion of the facts are admittedly on the other side. In religion North Galatia was neither Gallic nor Roman, but Anatolian ; and inscriptions and coins show that in the middle of the first century not only was the Greek language in use (alongside of the Celtic tongue), but Greek ideas prevailed to a limited extent.

The question respecting the third proposition becomes, therefore, not whether there is in the epistle any reflection of Greek civilization, but whether it is of such extent and character as to exclude the possibility of the latter having been written to a people so little affected by Hellenism as those of North Galatia. Ramsay's proofs on this

<sup>1</sup> "The evidence is overwhelming. About A. D. 50 Galatia was essentially un-Hellenic. Roman ideas were there superimposed directly on a Galatian system which had passed through no intermediate stage of transformation to the Hellenic type. It was only through the gradual, slow spread under Roman rule of a uniform Græco-Roman civilization over the East that Galatia began during the second century after Christ to assume a veneer of Hellenism in its later form" (p. 160).

point (as advanced in the "Commentary") are practically four : the idea of sonship and adoption as related to inheritance, the conception of the *διαθήκη*, the notion of the *παιδαγωγός*, and the distinction between the *οἰκονόμος* and the *ἐπίτροπος*. The first of these seems to have no force. The notion that Paul conceives of faith as "property" of Abraham which, being found in possession of the gentiles, proves them by the law of inheritance to be his sons, seems forced into the passage rather than found in it, and it is impossible (especially in view of Rom. 8 : 16) to resist the impression that Ramsay makes too vigorous a use of the dissociation of sonship and heirship in Roman law. The argument from the *διαθήκη* is far more forcible, and Ramsay has apparently made at this point a most valuable contribution to the interpretation of the epistle. Yet, accepting the correctness of his interpretation, and recognizing the *διαθήκη* of Paul's thought as Greek rather than Roman, we do not feel sure that the evidence of the non-Hellenization of North Galatia quite amounts to excluding the possibility of the Greek *διαθήκη* being known there. The case is much the same in respect to the other two points, of which there is not space to speak in detail.

In short, Ramsay has succeeded in showing that in several respects, pertaining almost entirely to the relations of parents and children, Paul's letter to the Galatians reflects a civilization which we have more reason to suppose to have existed in South Galatia than in North Galatia. But he has stated the conclusion which he deduces from this fact with a vigor and confidence which the evidence scarcely warrants. He has advanced no definite evidence that in matters of education and inheritance North Galatia had remained unaffected by Hellenism, or that Hellenic ideas were so unknown in North Galatia that Paul could not write intelligibly from his own Greek point of view. It seems, indeed, by no means impossible that if archæological discoveries should some day carry our knowledge of affairs Galatian as much beyond the present status as that status itself owes to Ramsay's valuable investigations, it would appear that there was quite enough of Hellenism in North Galatia to explain all Paul's language in Galatians. That there is good and valid evidence for the South-Galatian view, aside from that which Ramsay advances in this volume, we firmly believe ; that the preponderance of evidence is on the whole on that side, we believe ; that this volume makes a valuable contribution to the subject, we recognize ; and yet that the South-Galatian view may some day be overthrown seems somewhat more probable than before we read this book.

The second part of the book is, as a whole, distinctly inferior in value to the first. Parts of it are very valuable—notably the treatment of the *διαθήκη* already referred to. Some of it is the sheerest special pleading.<sup>2</sup>

As a whole, the book is the most valuable direct contribution to biblical science that Ramsay has made; yet has the excellences and defects of all his work in this field. With a wealth of historical knowledge which might be the envy of any New Testament scholar, did not Ramsay's generous use of it turn envy into gratitude, he has given us a book bristling with brilliant suggestions, devoid of any exact exegetical method, marked by overconfidence of statement, inconclusiveness in argument, fragmentariness and incompleteness of treatment. For the student who wants one or two trustworthy and reasonably complete commentaries on the epistle, some of the older books are, despite their defects, preferable to this. But thorough students of the epistle, especially future writers on the life and epistles of Paul or the apostolic age, will find in the introduction a thesaurus of information, and will have to reckon with it for some time to come.

ERNEST D. BURTON.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

<sup>2</sup> The argument concerning *ἕτερος* and *ἄλλος* leaps from classical usage to the New Testament, ignoring all Hellenistic usage, the inclusion of which would, if we mistake not, have modified the conclusion reached. The argument concerning the fourteen years of 2:1 simply begs the question. The whole discussion of Gal. 2:1-10 seems to us an example of unscientific procedure in exegesis. Complaining that other commentators are governed by their view of the relation of this section to Acts, Ramsay proceeds to control his own interpretation of it by the express assumption that the general meaning of the whole is that Paul is in perfect harmony with the three—a proposition not only unwarranted as a controlling presupposition, but excluded by any interpretation which does not assume it to start with. The interpretation of the Greek tenses on p. 297, "I consulted them . . . to prevent my work as it continues now, or my work then, from being ineffectual" (*μή πως εἰς κενὸν τρέχω ἢ ἔδραμον*), must be an inadvertent slip. Surely Professor Ramsay does not mean that the tenses of a clause introduced by *μή* and dependent on a verb of past time express time from the point of view of the speaker. The syntax of 2:1-10 is confessedly difficult, but we scarcely believe that the proposal to join *διὰ τοὺς παρεισάκτους ψευδαδελφούς* (vs. 4) with *κατ' ἰδίαν* (vs. 2) will commend itself to many. The dictum concerning the significance of the aorist *ἐσπούδασα* (2:10), that it "denotes something that was actually part of the incidents in Jerusalem," has no warrant in Greek usage, and the interjection of "then" ("which I then made it my duty to perform") is wholly unjustified. An aorist in such a clause may refer to an action coincident with, or antecedent or subsequent to, the time to which the principal clause refers. In fact, had Paul wished to express clearly the thought which Ramsay attributes to him, he must have used the imperfect.